



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1913

No. 16

The views as to the paramount importance of the study of archaeology which Mr. Luce expresses (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.105) have been discussed often before, but the fallacy is a perennial one and does not seem to yield to argument. It may be that "some knowledge of how the Greeks lived is necessary if students are to live in the Greek atmosphere while reading the Greek classics". But it certainly is not true that this knowledge is dependent upon the study of Greek archaeology alone, or even primarily. Greek atmosphere is in any case a matter of the imagination. It has to be artificially produced. For this production several things are desirable, archaeology among the number. But the one indispensable element is the Greek literature speaking through the teacher. We should never lose sight of the fact that archaeology can be studied with some success without any serious knowledge of Greek or Latin. In fact it is quite within the power of one who knows no Greek whatever to get into the Greek atmosphere, as it is grandiosely called, just as it is possible to study ancient history with no knowledge of the classical tongues. I have known not a few cultivated men and women who are more Grecian than some of ourselves, who have spent plenty of time in Greek lands, who have even assisted in excavating on occasion, and yet who are not acquainted with Greek. No, the perennial source of Greek atmosphere is the Greek literature itself, not indeed that literature which we are now preparing to plate over the barbarism of modern times by means of the neargold of the Loeb translations, but the genuine article, often mined with infinite labor and comprehended but dimly by the delving miner, the Greek itself. The man who has to be lured to the study of Greek by the interest which he has found in the remains of Greek art, or by the rewards of excavation is not really interested in Greek at all. He is interested in art or archaeology, and will probably find as much enjoyment in Mexican primitive life as he does in that of classical Africa. What help can a man get from the study of ancient cisterns for the better apprehension of the deathless message that Greek genius has for every thinking mind? What light is the shape of a Greek weapon or the arrangement of a Greek house going to throw upon the appeal of Achilles or Andromache? Some good people get over the wall, of course, but

in most cases they had no opportunity to get in by any other way; he who has the opportunity and prefers the wall is probably a man of dubious respectability. Dr. Bishop is of course overcharged, but his attitude has some basis, and when Greek literature becomes dependent upon archaeology for life, then it is time to devote the support of our Greek chairs to some other field.

Mr. Hecker's suggestion to enlarge the scope of the Freshman course by including selections from all of those ancient authors who throw light upon the life and civilization of the later Romans is, at first sight, a fascinating one. It is certainly true that the vast majority of our Freshman students have very little idea of the civilization of Rome and how intensely modern was the life and thinking of the Romans. And it is quite desirable that their horizon should be enlarged. But do not some of the considerations adduced above apply here also? Is it not a question of our whole aim in teaching Freshman Latin? Many of our Philistine opponents attack us on the ground that our instruction is not sufficiently practical. Certainly this suggestion of Mr. Hecker seems to be along the same line. But do we want to yield to this demand? If so, why not say frankly that our course is not so much a course in Latin as a course in Roman civilization? This is not merely a possible course but the topic deserves much more consideration than has thus far been granted to it. But in that case what becomes of our Latin? Mr. Hecker claims that the Commentaries of Gaius present the Roman Law in "lucid and elegant Latin", and this is true, but we have some lucid and elegant Latin on subjects that no one would want presented to our youth, and while Roman Law, of course, is not such a subject, still the question of subject is important. To particularize, would it be right to remove Horace or Livy or Terence in favor of Petronius, Suetonius, St. Augustine, or Gaius? We can not have the former and the latter too; we must take some to the exclusion of the others. Similarly, is Persius fit food for Freshmen as they are usually prepared? Persius, to speak gently, is not easy, and the Freshman would need a translation to read him at all, as in fact do many teachers. Quintilian and Pliny are of course included in most college courses, but later. Which is of more worth at this time, Livy or Pliny? What Mr.

Hecker really wants his Freshmen to know is not Latin literature so much as the civilization of the later Roman Empire, a laudable desire. But the way to accomplish this is not to make room for selections from later authors covering this subject, but to assign in connection with the work of the class, such reading from books like Dill's or Friedländer's as may convey the information that Mr. Hecker has in mind. In fact it would be a very valuable addition to the work of any Freshman class, if the students were expected to read around the actual authors studied. Our results are pitifully narrow, but after all we still are trying to teach Latin literature, and to bring our students into more or less intimate relation with some great minds. And this is really the best education.

G. L.

THE ENCOMIUM ON HELEN, BY GORGIAS¹

In the centuries succeeding Homer we find in Greek literature numerous disparaging animadversions on Helen of Sparta and Troy. Celebrated and familiar is the recantation of Stesichorus, who was compelled to retract, in the famous palinode, his abuse of the lady. It will be recalled that Aeschylus (Agam. 689), punning on her name, calls her, as Browning translates, "Ship's-hell, Man's-hell, City's-hell".

The praise of Helen, however, became a favorite theme with the rhetoricians. The difficulty of a vindication was a constant invitation and challenge to their rhetorical skill and ingenuity. We find the Dean of the Professors of Rhetoric, Isocrates, devoting himself warmly to this subject in Oration 10. At the beginning of this discourse (Sec. 14) he praises the writer of an extant Encomium on Helen for choice of subject, but finds fault with him for writing not an encomium, but a defence and apology, and proceeds further to say, in his usual self-satisfied way, that he will show this writer, unfortunately not named, how the subject should have been treated.

Does Isocrates allude to the Encomium by his teacher, Gorgias? Most probably. Certainly the criticism applies to Gorgias. Is the so-called Encomium on Helen which is extant under the name of Gorgias authentic? Spengel and Jebb (see *The Attic Orators*), think not; the latter declares that the composition does not bear any of the distinctive marks of the style of Gorgias! This seems an amazing statement, inasmuch as the Encomium fairly bristles with all the characteristic Gorgian figures and frigidities. Blass (in *Attische Beredsamkeit* 1.66 and in the Teubner text of Antiphon, page xxviii) and Norden (*Die antike Kunstprosa*) believe that it is genuine. In this view I concur.

What are the figures and the rhetorical devices

which produce the Gorgian *ὄγκος*, magnificent and monotonous, and that style which is characterised by a plethora of words and a paucity of ideas? They are antithesis, paronomasia, alliteration, repetition of words, likeness of sound in final syllables of successive words and clauses, and arrangement of words in nearly equal periods. Add to these, alternating amplification and brevity, a rhythm making prose akin to poetry, bold metaphors and poetic or unusual epithets. The Encomium on Helen abounds in all these.

Is it surprising that the Athenians in the assembly were carried away by the novelty of this brilliant oratory, when, in 427 B.C. they were addressed by the rhetor Gorgias, the head of the Sicilian envoys? For, as Diodorus (12.53) says, the Athenians, by nature, were clever and lovers of eloquence. Especially were the young men captivated and Gorgias's services as a teacher were in great demand.

These characteristics of Gorgias's style, which impress us as inartistic in the extreme, met with high praise or strong censure in his own and subsequent generations. But the potent influence of the Sicilian rhetor is easily seen alike on the style of Antiphon, of Thucydides and of Isocrates. With Gorgias begins epideictic literature, that display rhetoric, which was destined ever afterwards to color and to influence profoundly Greek oratory and prose style.

It is my aim to give an English version of the most interesting portions of the Helen, a short but astounding composition in which the innovator and master of *ἡ ποιητικὴ καὶ τροπικὴ φράσις* fairly out-did himself. Yet in justice to Gorgias it must be remembered that the author, at the conclusion of his effort, characterizes it as a *παλῖνον*. Lack of space forbids the occasional quotation of the Greek which would show, I hope, that the translation is faithful to the florid and frigid original. References by section, however, are made to the text of the Helen, which is to be found in the Teubner edition of Antiphon (ed. by Blass).

1. Embellishment to a city is the valor of its citizens; to a person, comeliness; to a soul, wisdom; to a deed, virtue; to discourse, truth. But the opposite to these is lack of embellishment. Now a man, woman, discourse, work, city, deed, if deserving of praise must be honored with praise, but if undeserving must be censured. For it is alike aberration and stultification to censure the commendable and commend the censurable.

2. It is the duty of the same individual both to proclaim justice wholly, and to declaim against injustice holily, to confute the detractors of Helen, a woman concerning whom there has been uniform and universal praise of poets and the celebration of her name has been the commemoration of her fame. But I desire by rational calculation to free the lady's reputation, by disclosing her detractors as prevaricators, and by revealing the truth to put an end to error¹.

¹ The text of Section 2 is unsound.

¹ An abridged form of a paper read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Philadelphia, May 3, 1912.